UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,919	04/14/2004	James J. Modliszewski	60306-USA	7365
Paul A. Fair	7590 08/28/200	8	EXAM	IINER
Patent Adminis		SASAN, ARADHANA		
FMC Corporation 1735 Market St		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Philadelphia, P.	A 19103	1615		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/824,919	MODLISZEWSKI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	ARADHANA SASAN	1615					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>13 August 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(1)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered be	cause				
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE beloge) (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in beth 	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);					
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a control of the control of	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the							
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,5-22 and 29-38. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 23-28.		l be entered and an e	xplanation of				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ll and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).				
10.	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's argument that persons skilled in the art would have no motivation to try to form gel films and capsules using propylene glycol alginate is not persuasive because Gilleland discloses alginate as a film forming component (Col. 2, lines 13-15 and lines 29-32). Colegrove teaches propylene glycol alginate gels (Col. 1, lines 20-26). One with ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious to use the propylene glycol alginate gel former in the film forming composition of Gilleland with a reasonable expectation of producing a functional gel film. One with ordinary skill in the art would know the utility of gel forming and film forming components for making capsules, and would use the propylene glycol alginate in a capsule shell formulation. Regarding the rejection of claim 35, Applicant argues that Cade does not disclose the use of propylene glycol alginate. However, Cade is combined with Gilleland and Colegrove in order to provide the teaching of a gel fim composition without a plasticizer. Regarding the nonstatutory obviousness type double patenting rejection, Applicant did not point out that the obviousness-type double patenting rejection was improper. This is considered non-responsive. Applicant must point out the reasons why the obviousness-type double patenting rejection is improper or file a terminal disclaimer in order to be responsive. A request to hold a rejection in abeyance is non-responsive. See 37 C.F.R. 1.111.

/Aradhana Sasan/ Examiner, Art Unit 1615

> /MP WOODWARD/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1615